

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-11, and 14-17 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-17 stand rejected. Claims 18-21 were previously withdrawn from consideration. In the interest of expediting prosecution, Claims 3 and 12 are cancelled herein. Claims 1-2, 4-11, and 14-17 have been amended herein. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the application, drawings and claims as originally filed and, as such, no new matter has been presented. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

APPLICANT'S INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicant thanks the Examiner for speaking with the undersigned on Tuesday, October 31, 2006. In the interview, the pending claims were discussed along with the cited art. The Examiner stated that in light of the proposed claim amendments, she would need to further consider the cited art. Therefore, no agreement was reached as to the patentability of the proposed claims.

ELECTION/RESTRICTIONS

The undersigned acknowledges the Examiner's acceptance of Applicant's election without traverse of the invention of Group I pursuant to Applicant's response filed on May 17, 2006. Applicant also notes that Claims 18-21 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 10, 12-13, and 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakagawa et al. (U.S. Pat. App. No. 2002/0197869; hereinafter "Nakagawa"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially, Applicant notes that Nakagawa appears to disclose a water-based resist stripping liquid management system that includes a bath 1 for providing a stripping solvent via a pipeline 10 to a sprayer 7. The sprayer 7 sprays the solvent on substrates 6 that pass beneath the sprayer 7 on a roller conveyer 5. In contrast to Nakagawa, independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

removing an amount of resin from the object by **submersing** the object in the liquid in a manner such that the amount of resin becomes dissolved in the liquid and thereby increases the ratio of the dissolved resin to the solvent of the liquid, the increase of the ratio altering an electrical characteristic of the liquid; and . . . (emphasis added).

Independent Claim 10 has been amended to recite:

removing an amount of resin from the object ~~viaby~~ **submersing** the object in the liquid such that the amount of resin becomes dissolved in the liquid and thereby alters the electrical characteristic of the liquid; . . . (emphasis added).

Independent Claim 17 has been amended to recite:

removing an amount of material by **submersing** the object in the liquid such that the amount of material becomes additional solute in the liquid and thereby increases the ratio of the solute to the solvent of the liquid, the increase of the ratio altering an electrical characteristic of the liquid the liquid comprising Tripropylene Glycol Methyl Ether; and . . . (emphasis added).

In view of the above discussion, Applicant respectfully asserts that Nakagawa does not teach, suggest or disclose each and every element of Claims 1, 10 and 17. In this regard, Nakagawa does not teach, suggest or disclose removing an amount of resin from an object by submersing the object in the liquid. Rather, Nakagawa only teaches **spraying** a substrate with a stripping liquid from a sprayer, and does not teach, suggest or disclose whatsoever **submersing** the object in the liquid. Nakagawa merely

discloses that the substrates are sprayed with a liquid to remove the resist and metal oxides from the top layer of the substrate, which is substantially different than submersing an object in the liquid to remove a resin. In addition, Applicant notes that it would be improper to modify Nakagawa to include submersing the substrate in a liquid as there is no suggestion of making this modification, and further, to modify Nakagawa to include submersing the liquid in the bath would impermissibly modify the principle of operation of the stripping liquid management system.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully asserts that Nakagawa does not teach each and every element of Claims 1, 10 and 17, and as such, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claims 1, 10 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

With regard to Claims 4, 6, 7, 13 and 16, Applicant notes these claims depend directly or indirectly from either independent Claims 1 or 10, and thus, should be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth for Claims 1 and 10 above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of Claims 4, 6, 7, 13 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 5 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagawa et al. in view of Oberlander et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,368,421; hereinafter "Oberlander"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to Claims 2, 5 and 11, Applicant notes these claims depend directly or indirectly from either independent Claims 1 or 10, and thus, should be in condition for

allowance for the reasons set forth for Claims 1 and 10 above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of Claims 2, 5 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 8, 9, 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagawa et al. in view of Kung (U.S. Pat. App. No. 2004/0160225; hereinafter "Kung"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant notes that Claims 8, 9, 14 and 15 depend from either independent Claim 1 or 10, and thus, Claims 8, 9, 14 and 15 should be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth for Claims 1 and 10 above.

In addition, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Kung patent neither appears to disclose a solvent saturation system for use with a rapid prototyping system nor relates to the field of the solvent saturation systems or a field reasonably pertinent to the resolution of the problem being solved by the present disclosure. Applicant submits that as the present disclosure deals with a solvent saturation system for use with a rapid prototyping system that one of ordinary skill in the art of solvent saturation systems would not have been logically commended to review the operations of a combination battery, light bulb and fuse detector to solve the problem to which the present application is directed (i.e., to monitor the saturation level of a solvent during a rapid prototyping process). Consequently, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Kung reference is not analogous art and cannot be properly combined with Nakagawa or cited as prior art.


Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of Claims 8, 9, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10/31/06

By: 
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686
Erica K. Schaefer, Reg. No. 55,861

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/EKS/chs